

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 20-100 are currently pending in this application. Claims 20, 32, 55, 62, 76, and 83 have been amended. Applicant notes that the Office Action Summary as mailed on 04/17/2007 is in error which states that claims 21-100 is/are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 20, 21, 32, 34, 44, 55, 62, 64, 68, 76, 83, 85, 89 and 97-100 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kikinis, U.S. Patent No. 5,727,159. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Kikinis does not teach amended independent claims 20, 55, and 76, and all claims dependent therefrom. Applicant has amended the claims wherein the image is of the entire document, and not from the document. Thereby the image is an image of the entire document, and not a portion of the document. The claims have also been limited that the image include non-linkable graphical representations of links, which is a novel limitation not found in the references (see specification, page 11, lines 1-7).

Applicant also continues to disagree with the Office Actions belief that Kikinis teaches compression of an image. As the Office Action notes on page 19, Kikinis teaches a JPEG file is converted into a dithered bitmap file. It is well known in the art that a JPEG file is a compressed file format, and a bitmap file is an uncompressed file format. Therefore what Kikinis teaches is data conversion, and not compression, a difference which one skilled in the art would immediately recognize.

Kikinis also does not teach amended independent claims 32, 62, and 83, and all claims dependent therefrom. Applicant has amended the claims to add the novel limitation that the image includes a non-linkable graphical representation of at least one

link. This limitation is not found within the references, and is completely novel as it gives complete control to the server for document changes.

Applicants also notes that Kikinis (Col. 6, lines 41-44) and Gardell (Col. 5, lines 33-40), explicitly teach clients which display working links. Therefore applicant believes these references teach away from applicant's claims, and that one skilled in the art using common sense when viewing these references would not view applicant's claims as obvious.

In light of the foregoing arguments applicant believes that claims 20, 21, 32, 34, 44, 55, 62, 64, 68, 76, 83, 85, 89 and 97-100 are not anticipated by Kikinis and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 22, 63, and 84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis, and further in view of Dorricott (U.S. 6,125,209). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 22, 24, 35, 36, 38, 41-43, 56, 57, 65, 67, 77, 78 and 88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis, and further in view of Gardell et al. (U.S. 6,049,831). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 23 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis- Gardell, and further in view of Ouellette et al. (US 5,581,243). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 25, 37, 40, 66 and 87 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis- Gardell, and further in view of Clough et al. (US 5,379,057). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 23-31, 45-51, 58-61, 69-74, 79-82 and 90-95, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis, and further in view of MacLeod, et al. (US 5,778,092). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 52-54, 75 and 96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis, and further in view of Cronin, III et al. (US 6,182,127). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant believes the above rejections are moot, as applicant believes that the novelty rejection to the base claims to which the above claims depend from no longer applies, and to which the addition of the above references do not remedy. Therefore applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections under U.S.C §103(a).

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: Aug. 17, 2007



James C. Scheller, Jr.
Reg. No. 31,195

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300